

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/899,039 07/06/2001 612.40260X00 1364 **Emmanuel Duret** 20457 12/23/2004 **EXAMINER** 7590 ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP FREJD, RUSSELL WARREN 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER **SUITE 1800** ARLINGTON, VA 22209-9889

. 2128 DATE MAILED: 12/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application N .	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/899,039	DURET ET AL.
	Examin r	Art Unit
	Russell Frejd	2128
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet wi	th the c rresp nd nce address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT! - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicatie. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory in - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a non. , a reply within the statutory minimum of thirt period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	·	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	09 October 2001.	
•	This action is non-final.	•
3) Since this application is in condition for al closed in accordance with the practice un	•	•
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the applic 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wit 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 6-8 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 4,5 and 9-14 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	hdrawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exa	miner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection t	o the drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the c	orrection is required if the drawing	s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	ne Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International B * See the attached detailed Office action for	ments have been received. ments have been received in A priority documents have been ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10.9.01</u>. 		e)/Mail Date Iformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Serial Number: 09/899,039 Page 1

In re Application of: Dur t tal.

Examination of Application #09/899,039

1. Claims 1-14 of application 09/899,039, filed on 6-July-2001, are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made. The factual inquiries set forth in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459

(1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering the objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Hill et al. (hereinafter Hill), U.S. Patent No. 5,741,980.
- 4. Hill disclosed the invention as substantially as claimed, including a neural network used to determine the flow rate and other typical variables associated with single and two phase flows

Serial Number: 09/899,039 Page 2

In re Application of: Duret et al.

in a conduit [c. 27, l. 15-17], including real time applications [c. 27,l. 29] of two phase water/air flows [c. 28, l. 51](see applicant's preamble);

a non-linear neural network [c. 27, l. 19], including an input layer for receiving known flow indicator quantities for a broad range of known conditions [c. 27, l. 35-46] (applicant's input layer);

an output layer for outputting results corresponding to the flow rates [c. 28, l. 7-8](applicant's output layer with flow mode estimation quantities);

a hidden layer [c. 27, l. 44](applicant's intermediate layer);

training the neural network by inputting known flow indicator quantities for a broad range of known conditions [c. 27, I. 36], and using a sigmoidal function called a "logistic" function for mapping any input value to an output [c. 27, I. 63-65](applicant's creating a learning base for connecting output data to corresponding input data); and

using a set of weighted connections to determine the links between the input layer and the output layer [c. 27, I. 51 through c. 28, I. 3](applicant's iterations of weighting factors for connecting vales between the inputs and outputs)[claims 1 and 6].

Hill does not specifically teach the pipe structure parameters of the present invention. However, Hill does disclose a neural network that does not require any assumptions about the form or the correlation between a set of inputs and the desired set of outputs [c. 27, I. 21-24]. For at least this reason, one of ordinary skill would have found it obvious to modify the neural network of Hill to include structure of the pipe among the input information because the neural network is a very fast and efficient way for providing reasonable estimates of operating

Serial Number: 09/899,039 Page 3

In re Application of: Duret et al.

conditions in real time applications [c. 27, I. 27-34], in this case, determining the flow rate and other typical variables associated with single and two phase flows in a conduit [c. 27, I. 15-17].

In regard to claims 2 and 7, filtering the raw data for obtaining the appropriate information to be input to the neural network for processing [c. 28, I. 43-50](applicant's sorting feature).

In regard to claims 3 and 8, a neural network having an input, connected to a hidden (intermediate) layer, which is connected to an output layer [c. 27, I. 41 through c. 28, I. 5] (applicant's totally connected network).

Claim Objections

5. Claims 4, 5 and 9-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response Guidelines

- 6. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (see MPEP 710.02, 710.02(b)).
- 7. Any response to the Examiner in regard to this non-final action should be

directed to: Russell Frejd, telephone number (571) 272-3779, Monday-Friday

from 0530 to 1400 ET, or the examiner's supervisor, Jean Homere,

telephone number (571) 272-3780.

mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: (703) 872-9306

In re Application of: Duret et al.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to 220 South 20th Street, Crystal Plaza Two, Lobby, Room 1803, Arlington. VA., 22202.

Date: 13-December-2004

RUSSELL FREJD PRIMARY EXAMINER